

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. In the Office Action mailed January 30, 2006, claims 1-3 have been rejected, and claims 4-22 have objected to. In response, the Applicant has submitted the following remarks, amended claims 1 and 9, and cancelled claims 3-4. Accordingly, claims 1-2 and 5-22 are pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amended claims and the remarks below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,706,595 to van den Haak (hereinafter van den Haak). In light of the above claim amendments, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

Within the Office Action, it is stated that van den Haak discloses, in Figs. 5D-E, an anchor including a first fluke or base member 3, an elongated shank member 2, that is fixedly attached to said first fluke member, said shank member 2 being adapted to receiving at least one anchor line by means of part 8, and a second fluke 21, that is adapted to be fixedly connected to said shank member 2, where said second fluke 21 is spaced apart from said first fluke 3, as shown in Fig. 5D. It is also stated that the second fluke 21 is disposed substantially parallel to said first fluke 3, and said second fluke 21 is smaller than said first fluke 3.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the anchor disclosed in van den Haak, while indeed disclosing a second fluke 21 in Fig. 5D, does not teach or include any type of stabilizing means. Following, the van den Haak reference certainly does not teach the second fluke being secured to the stabilizing means, furthermore, the second fluke in the van den Haak reference is not taught to be secured to the uppermost surface of a shank member of the anchor.

In contrast to the teachings of van den Haak, the anchor of the present invention includes a first fluke and a second fluke, wherein the first and second fluke are disposed substantially parallel to each other, and wherein the second fluke is of a smaller size than

said first fluke. The anchor of the present invention also includes an elongated shank member that is fixedly attached to the first fluke, and a stabilizing means associated with the first fluke which includes a substantially semi-circular member that ensures that the anchor readily assumes an operating configuration and may be restored to this configuration if disturbed. The anchor of the present invention is configured such that the second fluke is fixedly secured to the upper most surface of the shank member and to the stabilizing means.

The amended independent claim 1 is directed to an improved anchor comprising a first fluke or base member, one end thereof constituting a leading end of said anchor and being adapted to assist in anchorage/embedding of said anchor within a given holding; an elongate shank member fixedly attached to said first fluke, said shank member being adapted to receive, and releasably retain, at least one anchor line; stabilizing means associated with said first fluke or base member, said stabilizing means including a member which is substantially semi-circular in shape, said stabilizing means serving to ensure that said anchor readily assumes an operating configuration and is restored to said operating configuration even after having been disturbed therefrom; and a second fluke associated with said shank member and adapted to be fixedly secured to the uppermost surface of said shank member and to said stabilizing means said second fluke being spaced apart from said first fluke and disposed substantially parallel thereto, and wherein said second fluke is of a smaller size than said first fluke. As described above, van den Haak does not teach a stabilizing means, nor does van den Haak teach the second fluke being secured to an uppermost surface of the shank member and to the non-existent stabilizing means. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of van den Haak.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over van den Haak in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,970,902 to Francis (hereinafter Francis). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

Application No. 10/517,996
Amendment Dated April 24, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2006

Claim 2 is dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of van den Haak. Accordingly, claim 2 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim. Claim 3 has been cancelled.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-22 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if re-written in independent including all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claims 5-22 are dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of van den Haak. Accordingly, claims 5-22 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim. Claim 9 has been amended to remedy a typographical error.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims are now in a condition for allowance, an allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (414)271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By Christopher M. Scherer
Christopher M. Scherer
Reg. No. 50,655

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Phone: (414)271-7590
Facsimile: (414)271-5770
Atty. Docket No. 4977-00007